



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF
CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS
Public Information Office
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

415-865-7740

Lynn Holton
Public Information Officer

NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: 50

Release Date: September 17, 2008

State Supreme Court to Hold Special Outreach Session in Riverside County's Coachella Valley

2,000 Local Students to Hear Oral Arguments Involving Medical Marijuana Law, Death Penalty, Other Legal Issues

San Francisco—More than 2,000 high school and college students in Riverside County's Coachella Valley will see the California Supreme Court in action at a special public outreach session on October 7–8, 2008, at the Indian Wells Theater, California State University San Bernardino, Palm Desert Campus, 37500 Cook Street, Palm Desert.

For the eighth year in a row, the Supreme Court will hold its annual special session to educate students about the courts and increase public understanding of the judicial branch of government. A network of local volunteer judges, court officials, attorneys, educators, and community organizations are coordinating the event. A total of nine high schools, two colleges, and one graduate school in the Coachella Valley will participate.

LIVE TELEVISION BROADCAST

California Channel, a public affairs cable network, will cablecast the court's two-day session live starting at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, October 7, when the justices will hold a question-and-answer session with the students. The network is available on 106 cable stations with 5.2 million viewers statewide. Local viewing information is available at www.calchannel.com/carriage.htm.

The cases involve both civil and criminal matters, including one death penalty appeal. The civil cases involve the state's "medical marijuana" law (the Compassionate Use Act); a dispute between a local congregation and national church over ownership of church property; a Sierra Club internal election dispute; and the applicability of a law providing

(over)

immunity for emergency care at the scene of an automobile accident. The criminal cases involve, among other things, the scope of a police search during a traffic stop based on missing license plates and whether a judge may impose a condition of probation requiring a defendant to provide notification of pet ownership.

The Supreme Court has launched an educational Web site to assist students and the public in learning about the cases to be argued. The site features detailed case summaries and online legal briefs: www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/riv-oralarg.htm.

During the next three weeks, teams of judges and lawyers from Riverside County will visit high school classrooms and provide students with an overview of the Supreme Court's history, its case process, and the cases to be argued before the court. During the session itself, students will be brought to the Palm Desert campus to take turns viewing the oral arguments.

Justice Douglas P. Miller, of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two (Riverside), chairs the planning committee. Members include Superior Court Presiding Judge Richard T. Fields; Supervising Judge Harold W. Hopp; Dean Fred Jandt, of California State University, San Bernardino Palm Desert Campus; Dr. Doris L. Wilson, retired superintendent, Desert Sands Unified School District, and professor of education at CSUSB; Ms. Tina Howe, of CSUSB Palm Desert Campus Facilities Services; Mr. Tim Parrott, executive director, Desert Town Hall-Indian Wells; Indian Wells attorneys Rob Bernheimer, Brian Harnik, and Martin Mueller; Palm Desert attorneys Dawn Swajian and Don Griffith; Ms. Donna Griffith; liaison for the Desert Bar Association; and Palm Springs attorney Peter Bochnewich.

In 2000, the Supreme Court launched its annual outreach program for high school students. These sessions have been conducted in Santa Ana, Fresno, San Jose, San Diego, Redding, Santa Barbara, and Santa Rosa.

The Supreme Court's calendar with case summaries follows, and also is available on the California Courts Web site at:

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/calendars/documents/SOCTA08.DOC.

For more detailed information on each case, please see this link on the court's Web site:

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/documents/rivallexpsun.pdf.

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SPECIAL SESSION—RIVERSIDE COUNTY
OCTOBER 7 and 8, 2008**

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. Generally, the descriptions set out below are reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted and are provided for the convenience of the public and the press. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2008—9:00 A.M.

Opening Remarks: Historic Special Session

(1) *People v. Hernandez (George)*, S150038

#07-106 *People v. Hernandez (George)*, S150038. (C051224, C051602; 146 Cal.App.4th 773; Superior Court of Sacramento County; 05F00765, 03F04161.) Review on the court's own motion after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

(2) *In re Raymond C.*, S149728

#07-105 *In re Raymond C.*, S149728. (C035822; 145 Cal.App.4th 1320; Superior Court of Orange County; DL020274.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a wardship proceeding.

Raymond C. and *Hernandez* both present the following issue: If a police officer sees that a motor vehicle lacks a rear license plate or both plates, may the officer make a traffic stop to determine if the vehicle has a temporary permit or if a displayed temporary permit is a valid one?

1:30 P.M.

(3) *Van Horn v. Watson (Torti, Respondent) (consolidated cases)*, S152360

#07-211 *Van Horn v. Watson (Torti, Respondent)*, S152360. (B188076, B189254; 148 Cal.App.4th 1013; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; PC034945.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Does the immunity provided by Health and Safety Code section 1799.102

for any person who “renders emergency care at the scene of an emergency” apply to a person who removed someone from a wrecked car because she feared it would burst into flames?

(4) *People v. Mentch (Roger)*, S148204

#07-15 *People v. Mentch (Roger)*, S148204. (H028703; 143 Cal.App.4th 1461; Superior Court of Santa Cruz County; 07429.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case includes the following issues: (1) Should the trial court have instructed the jury, as requested, on the “primary caregiver” affirmative defense under the Compassionate Use Act (Health & Saf. Code, § 11362, subd. (e)) the “medical marijuana” law) (2) If so, what is the standard of review for such instructional error? (3) Is the defendant’s burden to raise a reasonable doubt regarding the compassionate-use defense a burden of producing evidence under Evidence Code section 110 or a burden of proof under Evidence Code section 115? (4) Should the trial court instruct the jury on the defendant’s burden to raise a reasonable doubt and, if so, how?

(5) *People v. Doolin (Keith Zon)*, S054489 [Automatic Appeal]

This matter is an automatic appeal from a judgment of death.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2008—9:00 A.M.

(6) *Episcopal Church Cases*, S155094

#07-392 *Episcopal Church Cases*, S155094. (G036096, G036408, G036868; 152 Cal.App.4th 808; Superior Court of Orange County; JCCP No. 4392.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case includes the following issues: (1) Should the “principle of government” approach, also known as the “highest church judicatory” approach, be used to resolve disputes between a local congregation and a national church or regional diocese over ownership of church property, or should these disputes be resolved using a “neutral principles analysis”? (2) Was the complaint properly subject to a motion to strike under Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16? (3) What role does Corporations Code section 9142 play in the analysis and resolution of church-property disputes?

(7) *People v. Olguin (Alejandro)*, S149303

#07-108 *People v. Olguin (Alejandro)*, S149303. (E039342; nonpublished opinion; Superior Court of San Bernardino County; FSB051759.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: May a trial court impose a condition of probation requiring a probationer to notify his or her probation officer of any pet the probationer keeps?

(8) *Club Members For an Honest Election v. Sierra Club*, S143087

#06-69 Club Members For an Honest Election v. Sierra Club, S143087. (A110069; 137 Cal.App.4th 1166; Superior Court of San Francisco County; 429277.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting in part and denying in part a special motion to strike in a civil action. This case includes the following issue: Can the exception to the anti-SLAPP statute (Code Civ. Proc., § 425.16) for actions “brought solely in the public interest or on behalf of the general public” (Code Civ. Proc., § 425.17, subd. (b)) apply to a complaint that includes any claim for personal relief.

-#-